

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated August 10, 2005. Claims 1-11 are pending. Note that new dependent claim 11 has been added.

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claims 9 and 10. However, since claim 10 depends on claim 1 (and not claim 9), it is noted that claim 10 technically should be "objected to" as containing allowable subject matter as opposed to formally "allowed."

Claim 3

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Fitzpatrick. This Section 102(b) rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

It is noted that the Examiner agreed during a telephone call with the undersigned on August 4, 2005 that the changes made to claim 3 herein would place the claim in condition for allowance and overcome the Fitzpatrick rejection. The Examiner proposed this same amendment to claim 3 on August 4, 2005 to the undersigned to place this case in condition for allowance.

Claim 3 as amended herein requires "at a time point when a file icon of a file to be printed is superposed on said print icon, a printing preview of the file icon's associated file to be printed is displayed on said display picture." For example, see the instant specification at pg. 4, lines 20-25; pg. 18, lines 9-15; and Figs. 7 and 11. As shown in Figs. 7 and 11 for example, a "printing preview" as called for in claim 3 is an image of at least part of what is going to be printed. This is advantageous, for example, in that it permits a user to view and confirm contents of a file to be printed without having to open the file on an application (e.g., pg. 18, lines 12-15).

Fitzpatrick fails to disclose or suggest the aforesaid aspect of claim 3. A "printing preview" as called for in claim 3 is an image of at least part of what is going to be printed as shown in Figs. 7 and 11. Fitzpatrick does not display such a printing preview of the file icon when the file icon is superposed on the print icon. There is absolutely nothing in Fitzpatrick even remotely related to this aspect of claim 3. The cited art is entirely unrelated to the invention of claim 3, and the Section 102(b) rejection should be withdrawn for at least this reason.

Claim 1

Claim 1 stands rejected under Section 112, first paragraph. It is respectfully submitted that the changes to claim 1 herein address any potential issue in this respect. The specification as originally filed clearly supports this.

Claim 1 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Fitzpatrick in view of Hemenway. This Section 103(a) rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 requires that "the print icon is formed so that the display is altered according to a setting of the print conditions in said print icon, and said print conditions are displayed on said display picture in a recognizable display form when the file icon is not located over the print icon." Since print conditions may be displayed in accordance with a shape of a printer icon, when a document file is made dragging and dropping onto a printer icon, the printing conditions can be recognized without a particular operation such as hovering so that efficiency and convenience can be significantly improved in certain example embodiments of this invention. The cited art fails to disclose or suggest the aforesaid underlined aspect of claim 1.

Generally, both Fitzpatrick and Hemenway disclose "display set conditions of printer", so that operation has to be altered each time the set conditions are to be changed. However, in

certain example embodiments of this invention, the system displays a specific effect such that set conditions of printer can easily be altered by conducting a print processing of file based on print conditions set in the print icon. For example, a plurality of settings can be switched easily by preparing a plurality of print icons for which each different setting is made, respectively. For instance, see example non-limiting Exhibits A-B attached hereto. See also for example page 15, lines 3-13, of the instant specification.

Fitzpatrick discloses that a dragged document icon is hovered over a print icon for a few seconds. By continued hovering of the document icon over/on the print icon, a dialog box for altering print conditions is displayed. Thus, Fitzpatrick discloses that print conditions are displayed when a certain operation is made on a printer icon, but that print conditions cannot be recognized unless the operation is carried out. In particular, in Fitzpatrick print conditions are displayed *only* when such hovering over/on the print icon is performed. Accordingly, it can be seen that Fitzpatrick *fails* to disclose or suggest that print conditions are displayed on said display picture in a *recognizable display form when the file icon is not located over the print icon* as required by claim 1. Instead, Fitzpatrick teaches directly away from this aspect of claim 1 and cannot render the same unpatentable.

Hemenway also fails to disclose or suggest that "print conditions are displayed on said display picture in a *recognizable display form* when the file icon is not located over the print icon" as required by claim 1. Hemenway discloses that print conditions are displayed on a different window; hence it is very inconvenient for recognizing when dragging and dropping is carried out. Since both cited references fail to disclose or suggest at least the "recognizable display form" aspect of claim 1, then even the alleged combination (which is incorrect in any event) fails to meet the invention of claim 1. With this claimed feature, it advantageously

becomes possible in certain example embodiments for an operator to easily recognize the print condition without performing any specific operation.

Accordingly, even the alleged combination fails to disclose or suggest the invention of claim 1. Moreover, there is no suggestion in the art of record for the alleged combination, and there is certainly no suggestion in the art of record which would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the base reference to Fitzpatrick in a manner which would meet claim 1. Instead, Fitzpatrick teaches directly away from the invention of claim 1 since in Fitzpatrick print conditions are displayed *only* when such hovering over/on the print icon is performed (which is the opposite of what claim 1 requires).

Conclusion

It is respectfully requested that all rejections be withdrawn. All claims are in condition for allowance. If any minor matter remains to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with regard to the same.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 

Joseph A. Rhoa
Reg. No. 37,515

JAR:caj
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100